Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

NOT FOR CITATION	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	4
SAN JOSE DIVISION	

FELTON A. SPEARS, JR. and SIDNEY SCHOLL, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FIRST AMERICAN EAPPRAISEIT (a/k/a eAppraiseIT, LLC), a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendant << (s) >>.

Case No. 5:08-cv-00868 RMW (HRL)

E-FILED: October 10, 2013

ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE **JOINT REPORT NO. 3**

[Re: Docket No. 339]

In Discovery Dispute Joint Report (DDJR) No. 3, plaintiffs request that the deposition of non-party Peter Gailitis be extended for an additional 30-minute examination by telephone. This court is told that Gailitis was Chief Appraiser at defendant First American eAppraiseIT (EA) during most of the period in which EA performed appraisal services for Washington Mutual. He was deposed on September 17, 2013. Plaintiffs examined him for their allotted 4.5 hours. EA deposed the witness for its allotted 2.5 hours. Plaintiffs said they wished to conduct a redirect examination. Gailitis agreed to make himself available for a further 30-minute deposition to be conducted by telephone on another day. That is fine by plaintiffs. EA, however, objects to any

Prior to the deposition, Gailitis said that he would be willing to stay beyond the presumptive7– hour limit to make sure that his deposition would be completed that day. During the final break in

Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

further examination of Gailitis, saying that it never agreed to a multi-day deposition. This matter is deemed suitable for determination without oral argument. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). Upon consideration of the parties' respective positions, the court grants plaintiffs' request for an additional 30-minute telephone examination.

With respect to EA's argument that the instant DDJR is untimely, the court will credit plaintiffs' assertion that they were trying to meet-and-confer to resolve a dispute as to which they believed the parties had not reached an impasse.

"Unless otherwise stipulated or ordered by the court, a deposition is limited to 1 day of 7 hours." Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(d)(1). The court must allow additional time consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2) if needed for a fair examination. Id.

The court finds good cause for the requested extension here. All indications are that Gailitis is a key witness. Plaintiffs wish to conduct a brief redirect examination, to last no more than 30 minutes by phone (and, indeed, plaintiffs are willing to split the 30 minutes with EA, if EA wishes). Gailitis has no problem with the additional examination, notwithstanding that he has already been deposed by the parties for 7 hours. EA has already prepared for, and completed, its examination of Gailitis. The court does not find that preparation for an additional 30-minute telephonic examination will impose an undue burden.

As for timing, EA says that the parties already have a full deposition schedule in these last two weeks leading up to the October 15 fact discovery cutoff. Nevertheless, given the limited extension of Gailitis' deposition being granted here, this court finds that there is some leeway in the current case schedule to allow his further deposition to be conducted beyond the October 15 cutoff date without jeopardizing the remaining case deadlines. Accordingly, Gailitis deposition is extended for an additional 30-minute telephonic examination to be completed before the November 15 expert disclosure deadline and on a date that will not require modification of the current case schedule. If EA decides that it wishes to ask the deponent further questions, the 30 minutes shall be split equally between plaintiffs and defendant. The parties and Gailitis shall work

EA's examination, however, Gailitis advised that he had to leave by 5:00 p.m. (Dkt. 339, DDJR No. 3 at 2).

Case 5:08-cv-00868-RMW Document 341 Filed 10/10/13 Page 3 of 4

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court Northern District of California 1

2

3

4

5

together in good faith to find 30 minutes on a date between now and November 15 to complete the
deposition. If the parties are unable to schedule a date before then, or if they find that conducting
Gailitis' deposition beyond the October 15 cutoff will require modification of the other case
management deadlines, they shall seek relief from Judge Whyte.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 10, 2013

HOW RD R. I OYD

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27

28

1	5:08-cv-00868-RMW Notice has been electronically mailed to:
2	Allison Lauren Libeu alibeu@irell.com
3	Alvin Matthew Ashley mashley@irell.com, sknight@irell.com
3	Angela M. Papalaskaris apapalas@dl.com, courtalert@dl.com
4	Christopher J Clark cjclark@dl.com
5	David A. Super david.super@bakerbotts.com
3	Ellen Mary M. Doyle edoyle@fdpklaw.com, filings@fdpklaw.com, gbrown@fdpklaw.com
6	Gretchen Freeman Cappio gcappio@kellerrohrback.com, cbrewer@kellerrohrback.com, eknerr@kellerrohrback.com, tlin@kellerrohrback.com
_	Harry Williams, IV hwilliams@kellerrohrback.com
7	Janet Lindner Spielberg jlspielberg@jlslp.com
8	Joel R. Hurt jhurt@fdpklaw.com
	John C. Hueston jhueston@irell.com
9	John Charles Hueston jhueston@irell.com, lhiles@irell.com
10	John M. Sorich jsorich@alvaradosmith.com
10	Jonathan Mark Lloyd jonathanlloyd@dwt.com, jeannecadley@dwt.com
11	Joseph N. Kravec, Jr jkravec@fdpklaw.com, filings@fdpklaw.com, jnk561@yahoo.com
10	Justin Nathanael Owens jowens@irell.com
12	Kevin C Wallace kwallace@dl.com Khesraw Karmand kkarmand@kellerrohrback.com
13	Kris Hue Chau Man kman@dl.com, sholstrom@dl.com
	Lynn Lincoln Sarko lsarko@kellerrohrback.com, cengle@kellerrohrback.com,
14	kwarner@kellerrohrback.com
15	Margaret Anne Keane margaret.keane@dlapiper.com, carol.stewart@dlapiper.com,
10	marianne.haines@dlapiper.com
16	Martin L. Fineman martinfineman@dwt.com, edithshertz@dwt.com, sfodocket@dwt.com
17	Michael D. Braun service@braunlawgroup.com, clc@braunlawgroup.com
1 /	Ryan E. Bull Ryan.Bull@bakerbotts.com
18	Sam N. Dawood samdawood@dwt.com, allanpatterson@dwt.com, cassandrabaines@dwt.com, nickverwolf@dwt.com
10	Stephen M. Ng stephen.ng@bakerbotts.com, leanna.gutierrez@bakerbotts.com
19	Stephen Michael Rummage steverummage@dwt.com, jeannecadley@dwt.com,
20	seadocket@dwt.com
	Sung-Min Christopher Yoo cyoo@alvaradosmith.com, crosas@alvaradosmith.com,
21	jyoung@alvaradosmith.com, mault@alvaradosmith.com
22	Tana Lin tlin@kellerrohrback.com, esiegel@kellerrohrback.com, rfarrow@kellerrohrback.com
	Wyatt A. Lison wlison@fdpklaw.com, filings@fdpklaw.com
23	
24	
24	
25	
2.5	
26	